

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-18 are rejected. Claim 1 is amended herein.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Gauthier et al. in View of Schwarz et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier et al. (U.S. Patent number 5,303,205) in view of Schwarz et al. (U.S. Patent number 6,508,325). The Examiner asserts that Gauthier et al. teaches ultrasonic transceivers placed along a side of a vehicle. The Examiner recognizes that Gauthier et al. does not teach the claimed side object detection system having a plurality of radar beams or the claimed attachment means for portably attaching the side object detection system. The Examiner relies upon Schwarz et al. as teaching the plurality of radar beams. The Examiner concludes that "...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of having a plurality of radar beams, and attachment means coupled to the side object detection radar transceiver, as disclosed by Schwarz, with the system of Gauthier...."

Applicants have amended Claim 1 herein to require "...a side object detection radar transceiver including an antenna adapted to provide a plurality of radar beams..."

Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "... a side object detection radar transceiver including an antenna adapted to provide a

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

plurality of radar beams; and attachment means coupled to the side object detection radar transceiver for portably attaching the side object detection radar transceiver to a vehicle," as set forth in Claim 1.

With this particular arrangement, the present invention provides a side object detection radar transceiver having a plurality of radar beams provided by a radar antenna.

The Examiner uses Schwarz et al. to teach a plurality of radar beams. However, in contrast, Schwarz et al. provides, for example, in FIG. 1, a plurality of sensors 26. Schwarz et al. describes that "...sensors 26 generally define a radar transmitter/receiver pair integral in a single sensor assembly." (column 3, line s 8-10) Applicants submit that each sensor 26 of Schwarz et al. is a transmitter/receiver pair. Applicants further submit that Schwarz et al. does not have an antenna adapted to provide a plurality of radar beams as claimed.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Gauthier et al., whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, and 15 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, and 15 are patentably distinct over the cited references at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that Claims 5 and 9 are further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al., whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "... the side object detection radar transceiver is portably attached to a vehicle window," as set forth in Claims 5 and 9. With regard to Claims 5 and 9, the Examiner states that "...Gauthier discloses the claimed radar display coupled to the side object detection radar transceiver." However, Applicants can find no mention in Gauthier et al. of an attachment to a vehicle window as claimed.

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

Applicants submit that Claims 13 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "... the radar display is adapted to be mounted so as to be visible to an occupant of the vehicle in a rear view mirror of the vehicle," as set forth in Claim 13. With this arrangement, the display is visible in the mirror glass. With regard to 13, the Examiner states that "...Gauthier discloses the claimed radar display coupled to the side object detection radar transceiver, which is met by a mirror display system 40, on the outside rear view mirror... ." However, Applicants can find no mention in Gauthier et al. of a display visible in the rear view mirror as claimed.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed.

Gauthier et al. in View of Schwarz et al. and Marcus et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier et al. in view of Schwarz et al. and further in view of Marcus et al. (U.S. Patent number 6,124,647). The Examiner recognizes that Gauthier et al. does not teach "...the claimed radar display is attached to the interior of the vehicle... ." The Examiner relies upon Marcus et al. as teaching "...an information display located in the interior or exterior of the vehicle... ." The Examiner concludes that "...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of a radar display attached to the interior of the vehicle, as disclosed by Marcus, with the system of Gauthier... ."

Claims 3 and 7 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 3 and 7 are patentably distinct over the cited references at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that Claim 3 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al. and Marcus et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "... the radar display is portably attached to the interior of the vehicle," as set forth Claim 3.

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

Applicants submit that Claim 7 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al. and Marcus et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...the side object detection radar transceiver is portably attached to the interior of the vehicle," as set forth in Claim 7.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed.

Gauthier et al. in View of Schwarz et al. and Schofield et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 6, 11, 12, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier et al. in view of Schwarz et al. and further in view of Schofield et al. (U.S. Patent number 5,786,772). The Examiner recognizes that Gauthier et al. does not teach "...the claimed radar display disposed on the radar transceiver..." The Examiner relies upon Schofield et al. as teaching the radar display disposed on the radar transceiver. The Examiner concludes that "...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of placing the display unit with the side radar monitoring unit, as disclosed by Schofield, with the system of Gauthier..."

Claims 6, 11, 12, 14, and 16 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 6, 11, 12, 14, and 16 are patentably distinct over the cited references at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that Claim 11 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al. and Schofield et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...the side object detection radar transceiver is portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle so as to be visible to an occupant of the vehicle," as set forth in Claim 11.

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

Applicants submit that Claim 12 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al. and Schofield et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...the side object detection radar transceiver is portably mounted to a vehicle window so as to be visible to an occupant of the vehicle," as set forth in Claim 12.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 6, 11, 12, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed.

Gauthier et al. in View of Schwarz et al. and Schofield et al. and Marcus et al

The Examiner rejects Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier et al. in view of Schwarz et al., Schofield et al, and further in view of Marcus et al. The Examiner recognizes that neither Gauthier et al. nor Schofield et al. teach "...the claimed radar transceiver is portably attached to the interior of the vehicle..." The Examiner relies upon Marcus et al. as teaching "...an information display located in the interior or exterior of the vehicle..." The Examiner concludes that "...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of a radar display attached to the interior of the vehicle, as disclosed by Marcus, with the systems of Gauthier and Schofield..."

Claim 10 depends from and thus includes the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claim 10 is patentably distinct over the cited references at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that Claim 10 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al. and Schofield et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...the side object detection radar transceiver is portably attached to the interior of the vehicle," as set forth in Claim 10.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed.

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

Gauthier et al. in View of Schwarz et al. and Dupay et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier et al. in view of Schwarz et al. and further in view of Dupay et al. (US Patent number 6,252,497). The Examiner recognizes that neither Gauthier et al. nor Schwarz et al. teach "...the claimed attachment means comprising a bracket or fasteners to couple the side object detection [system] to a vehicle window..." The Examiner relies upon Dupay et al. as teaching a towing unit "...mounted within the cab or any convenient place in which it may be monitored by the operator of a vehicle..." The Examiner concludes "...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching placing the object detecting device to a window and even the interior window of a vehicle..."

Claims 17 and 18 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 17 and 18 are patentably distinct over the cited references at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that Claim 17 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al. and Dupay et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...the attachment means comprises a bracket to couple the side object detection radar transceiver to an interior of a vehicle window," as set forth in Claim 17.

Applicants submit that Claim 18 is further patentably distinct over Gauthier et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Schwarz et al. and Dupay et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...the attachment means comprises hook and loop fasteners to couple the side object detection radar transceiver to an interior of a vehicle window," as set forth in Claim 18.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed.

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

In view of the above Amendment and Remarks, Applicants submit that Claims 1-18 and the entire case are in condition for allowance and should be sent to issue and such action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845, including but not limited to, any charges for extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 5, 2005

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By: Kermit Robinson

Kermit Robinson
Reg. No. 48,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
354A Turnpike Street, Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 24
Fax: (781) 401-9966
kr@dc-m.com

9341.doc